

Attachment B

Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Draft Checklist

to Implement Regulatory Reform and Integration

Criteria
<p>1. Does the checklist meet the “list of fundamentals on which the effort to revise the checklist is based”?</p> <p>The fundamentals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop project review form which integrates SEPA and GMA• Form starts with decisions already made• Use same basic terminology (SEPA, GMA)• Provide good project description and other elements of a NOA in first main section of form• Provide a condensed format for simpler/consistent projects• Different form for project and nonproject actions
<p>2. Does the checklist meet project checklist purpose and stakeholder information needs?</p> <p>The purposes are (also see project checklist purpose – Attachment C):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assists lead agency in threshold determination• Assists agencies in planning and decision making• Provides information and constructive exchange between applicant, public, and agencies• Provides single point of reference for env’l information <p>Note: Stakeholders include lead agency, agencies with jurisdiction and concern, tribes, public, env’l/neighborhood groups</p>
<p>3. Is the checklist user friendly?</p> <p>a. Can it be filled out by the applicant?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information needed is generally known by applicant or is reasonably available (may involve some technical assistance)• Form requires limited information to be provided by agency and/or the areas for agency use are clearly identified <p>b. Is it easy to fill out?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Easy to understand (straightforward),• Non duplicative,• Short as possible <p>c. Is it easy to review?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By lead agency, affected agencies, agencies with jurisdiction/expertise, environmental groups, neighborhood groups, public, tribes• Encourages/facilitates agency comment/information to be added to the document